A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES IN SPORTS OR DAILY LIFE AND POSTURAL SWAY IN UPRIGHT STANCE.

Published as: Kiers H, van Dieën J, Dekkers H, Wittink H, Vanhees L. A systematic review of the relationship between physical activities in sports or daily life and postural sway in upright stance. Sports Med. 2013 Nov;43(11):1171-89.

Abstract

Background

In many sports maintaining balance is necessary to compete at a high level. Also, in many health problems, balance is impaired. Postural sway (PS) is often used as an indicator of upright balance control and physical activity (PA) might enhance balance control. However, the relationship between PS and PA has never been systematically reviewed.

Objective

To summarize the evidence regarding the relationship between PS in upright bipedal and unipedal standing and PA.

Methods

A literature search was conducted in Medline, EmBase, CINAHL, Cochrane Database and PEDro, up to March 2012 without limits to the starting date. Characteristics and methodological aspects of each article were extracted by two reviewers. We used Centre of Pressure (CoP) velocity and variables related to the CoP area to compare studies.

Results

Thirty nine articles were reviewed from an initial yield of 2058 articles. Thirty seven studies had a comparative design, one study was a cohort study, and one was a randomized controlled trial.

Conclusion

The main conclusion was that in general sport practitioners sway less than controls, and high-level athletes sway less than low-level athletes. Additionally, we identified specific effects dependent on the use of vision, sport specific postures, and frequency and duration of the (sports) activity.

PS in unperturbed bipedal stance appears to have limited sensitivity to detect subtle differences between groups of healthy people.

1. Introduction

Postural sway (PS) is the pattern created by the process of continuous small body deviations from an upright body position countered by corrective torques[1]. It can be studied by recording the movement of the centre of pressure (CoP). Many health problems, such as low back pain[2], anterior cruciate ligament ruptures[3-5], ankle injury[6;7], stroke[8;9], diabetic neuropathy[10;11] and Parkinson's disease[11], are associated with an increase in PS. Several studies have also shown an increase in PS with aging[12-14]. It is generally thought that more spontaneous PS in unperturbed stance, is a result of impaired balance control. Optimizing balance control may benefit physical rehabilitation for health problems and the deteriorating effect of age.

In a recent review, Hrysomallis studied whether PS is a determinant of sports performance. Based on cross-sectional studies he concluded that balance ability is related to competition level for some sports, and to a number of performance measures[15]. In designing rehabilitation interventions, the opposite question is of interest: does performing physical (sport) activities lead to an improved balance control? Since studies reviewed by Hrysomallis were cross-sectional, the direction of causality, if any, is unsure, but the overall conclusion may suggest a positive answer. Indeed, numerous studies have found an association between PA and balance control, as measured by PS[7;16-43]. However, the data are inconclusive regarding direction and strength of the association. The fact that the review by Hrysomallis was not designed as a systematic review, therefore precludes a more definitive answer. Also, it is not clear which elements of PA are associated with a reduction in PS. Answering this question could prove useful in designing optimal interventions for balance control.

One possibility is that these elements of PA consist of a general transfer of training balancing activities to balance control and hence PS, for example there are indications that higher levels of PA could lead to a decrease in PS in the elderly[44;45]. On the other hand, it is possible that balance abilities are specific to a particular task, a principle known as Henry's hypothesis[46]. In this case, it is of interest which elements characterize the sports with the strongest association with PS.

Taking all these uncertainties into account, we formulated the following questions as the objective of this review: "is PA associated with a decrease in PS in unipedal or bipedal stance?" and "is practicing a sport that specifically challenges balance associated with a decrease in PS in unipedal or bipedal stance?".

2. Methods

A literature search was conducted in Medline, EmBase, CINAHL, Cochrane Database and PEDro up to the 3rd of March 2012. The following search string was used for the electronic databases: ("centre of pressure"[All Fields] OR "center of pressure"[All Fields] OR CoP[text word] OR "center of foot pressure"[All Fields] OR "postural sway"[All Fields] OR "force plate") AND ("Motor Activity"[Mesh] OR "Leisure Activities"[Mesh] OR "Human Activities"[Mesh] OR "Activities of Daily Living"[Mesh] OR sports). To exclude studies not focusing on healthy populations, "NOT ("Stroke"[Mesh] OR "Parkinson Disease, Secondary"[Mesh] OR "Parkinson Disease"[Mesh] OR "Multiple Sclerosis"[Mesh])" was attached to the strategy. The search strategy was adapted to each database. Two researchers (HK and HD) independently screened search results for potentially eligible studies. When titles and abstracts suggested that a study was potentially eligible for inclusion, a full text copy of the paper was obtained. In addition, all references of eligible papers were screened for relevant studies. Disagreement between researchers was resolved by discussion. Table 1 shows the criteria used for inclusion and exclusion. Data of the characteristics of the study were independently extracted by HK and HD.

Table I: Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion	Exclusion
• Studies concerning healthy adults (18-65y) • Studies that assess postural sway by centre of pressure area or velocity measurements in bipedal or unipedal stance without perturbations • Studies that compare groups that participate in different sports, or differ in level of activity. • Studies published in English, German, French or Dutch • Publications up to March 2012	▪ Single case reports ▪ Experiments with therapeutic interventions aimed to improve postural control ▪ Measurements on a moveable or non-firm surface

We included both cross-sectional and longitudinal studies. Since there is no consensus about a reliable and valid instrument to assess the methodological quality of cross-sectional studies[47;48], neither rating nor weighing of studies was performed. However, we extracted aspects of methodological quality from the reports and incorporated them in our interpretation of the results. The appraised variables were: comparability of studied groups on sex [49], age[50;51], body height[49], body weight[49;50], and foot length[49]. Furthermore we looked at group size, because of the potential lack of power in small sample sizes.

We only searched for studies that used variables that describe the movement of the CoP. Variables that were related to a static position, e.g. the mean CoP position or a change in the mean CoP position movement, were not analysed. Variables in the category ‘other’ were registered but not analysed. When no direct comparison was made between groups of interest by the authors of the articles, the available data (e.g., mean and standard deviation) were used to test whether differences were statistically significant.

3. Results

The search strategy yielded 2058 articles. Figure 1 shows a flow diagram, providing information about the number of studies, identified included and excluded studies, and reasons for exclusion. Based on titles and abstracts, 35 full text copies of the papers were obtained. Seven studies were excluded after reading full texts. Screening the references of the 28 articles that remained identified 22 additional and potentially relevant titles of which 6 articles were included. Finally, a search in all publications of first authors was conducted, after which a total of 39 articles were included. The characteristics and aspects of methodological quality of the included studies are presented in table 2, group comparisons and detailed results in table 3. PS was measured under different circumstances analyzed in different directions and quantified using a wide range of dependent variables. Therefore, in addition to the detailed results in table 3, a summary of the main results is presented in tables 4 and 5. In these tables, results are summarized as either a positive, a negative or no significant association. Table 4 describes comparisons of sport practitioners with control groups with no specific physical activities, or practitioners of the same or other sports at a lower level. In the following sections, these will be referred to as 'Controls'. Table 5 describes comparisons with sport practitioners of similar level from a different sport.



Figure 1: flow chart of publication selection.
n= number of studies.

Table II. Study Characteristics and aspects of methodological quality

Sport/activity	Author & year	Position	Trial	Task	Visual instructions	Sex	Age	Weight/height/foot size	General activity level	Sample size
Basketball	Leanderson et al.[52]	Foot in contact with other foot, arms close to chest	60 s preceded by an anticipation period of 15-30 s	NR	Focus at a spot on the wall	+	+	+	+	-
Cycling	Lion et al.[40]	NR	20 s. Mean of 3 trials	Sway as little as possible	Three-sided surroundings without focus	-	+	+	+	+
Dancing/ soccer	Gerbino et al.[22]	Foot raised, in contact with supporting leg. Arms could be used for balance freely	10 s, preceded by 10 s not analyzed. One practice trial. Mean of 3 trials	NR	Looking straight ahead	+	+	Dancers significant less weight	Dancers trained 2 hours more per day	+
Dancing	Hugel et al.[23]	Barefoot, positioning on marks, arms extended, head upright	20 s. One preliminary trial	Asked to maintain a static balance	looking on a mark on the wall at 2 m.	NR in controls	+	NR: likely to be different	Controls without regular physical activity	+
	Leanderson et al.[7]	Foot raised, in contact with supporting leg, arms held to the chest	60 s recording each foot, 15 s adaptation.	NR	Looking at a spot at 4m	+	+	“Confounding due to body height²“	NR	+
Dancing/ track athletes	Schmit et al.[33]	Shoulder-width stance, arms hanging naturally and comfortably	30 s. Mean of 4 trials Start of trial when participant stood stable	Asked to relax	NR	+	+	NR: likely to be different	+	-
	Simmons [34]	Barefoot, arms relaxed by the sides, feet shoulder width	20 s. Mean of 3 trials	NR	Three-sided surroundings without focus	+	+	+	+	+
Football	Handrigan et al.[53]	Feet 10 cm apart, arms alongside the body	30 s. Mean of 4 trials	Attempt to stand as still as possible	Fixing on a reference point on eye level	+	-	BMI in football & obese higher	-	+
General activity	Ageberg et al.[12]	Leg 90° hip and knee, arms hanging.	25 s , average of 3 trials preceded by 20 s not analyzed	Stand as motionless as possible	Looking at a mark on the wall	+	+	+	Variable of interest	+

Sport/activity	Author & year	Position	Trial	Task	Visual instructions	Sex	Age	Weight/height/foot size	General activity level	Sample size
Gymnastics	Asseman et al.[17]	Arms relaxed, bipedal, width freely chosen. Unipedal: leg fixed under the other knee.	34 s. Middle 32 s used for analysis. Mean of five trials per condition	Keep as still as possible	Horizontal gaze fixed on a mark at 3 m distance	NR for other sports	+	Gymnasts smaller and lighter	NR	+
	Gautier et al.[21]	Barefoot, comfortable position	70 s of which first 20 s analyzed	NR	Dark room, looking at a flat projection screen	+	+	+	+	+
	Vuillerme et al.[36]	Barefoot, feet together, hands hanging loosely	20 s of which the first 5 analyzed. Average of 8 trials	Remain as immobile as possible	Fixate at white cross at 1.20 m. EC: gaze straight-ahead	+	+	+	+	-
	Vuillerme et al.[37]	Barefoot, straight, arms hanging loosely, positioning as in Vuillerme [38]	10 s	Immobile as possible	Fixate at white cross at 1.20 m	+	+	+	+	-
	Vuillerme et al.[38]	Barefoot, feet 20◦, heels 4 cm apart, Unipedal: big toe of other foot touching medial ankle	20 s	Asked to sway as little as possible	Fixate at white cross at 1.20 m	+	+	+	+	-
Golf	Stemm et al.[54]	NR	10 s	NR	NR	+	+	+	NR	+
Ironman	Nagy et al.[28]	Barefoot, feet side by side, no space in between	20 s of which the last 16 used for analysis	Minimize PS	Looking at a mark on the wall	+	+	+	Variable of interest	-
Judo	Paillard et al.[55]	Bipedal, arms hanging, legs straight	51.2 s	Stand as still as possible	NR	+	+	+	+	-
Judo/dancing	Perrin et al.[32]	Feet 10 cm apart, arms along the body, barefooted	20 s	NR	Stare straight ahead at a dot on eye level 2 m away	F dancers, M judo, control mixed.	+	NR	Control group lower level	+
Rhythmic gymnastics	Calavalle et al.[18]	Barefoot , arms hanging freely at the side, feet 30° angle, heels 3 cm apart	60 s	Asking to stand as immobile as possible	Focus on eye level target	+	RG 4 yr younger vs controls	Height and weight less in RG	NR	+
Shooting	Aalto et al.[16]	Heels together, feet 30°, knees locked, arms crossed over the chest	90 s (30-57 s & 60-87 s used for analysis)	NR	NR	NR in controls	+	NR	NR	-

Sport/activity	Author & year	Position	Trial	Task	Visual instructions	Sex	Age	Weight/height/foot size	General activity level	Sample size
	Era et al.[20]	Shooting, top level wearing competition clothes	7.5 s preceding a shot, analyzed in 5 intervals of 1.5 s	Aiming	Aiming	+	+	Top level higher weight[1]	+	-
Shooting/ fencing	Herpin et al.[43]	Barefoot, arms at the sides	20 s	Remain as stable as possible	Look straight ahead at a dot on eye level 2 m away	+	+	+	Controls were sedentary	+
	Konttinen et al.[24]	Shooting position, with shooting and competition clothes	1 trial of 6 s preceding the shot. Data analyzed in intervals of 1.5 s	Aiming	Aiming	+	+	+	NR	-
	Larue et al.[25]	Shooting position, with shooting and competition clothes	6 s	Aiming	Aiming	NR	+	NR	NR	-
	Niinimaa et al.[29]	Shooting position, with shooting	60 s	Aiming	Aiming	+	Athletes ± 12 y older vs controls	+	NR	-
	Su et al.[35]	Comfortable and narrow stance	15 s	Aiming	Aiming	+	+	+	NR	+
Skiing	Noé et al.[42]	Knees extended	51.2 s	Remain as still as possible	NR	+	+	+	National/ regional level 25/12 hours p/w training	-
Soccer	Jakobsen et al.[56]	Elevated leg at least 5 cm above platform, hands at hip	2 trials of 30 s each leg. Trial with shortest path length per leg was averaged with other leg	NR	Looking at a fixed target, 1.65 m high, 2.5 m away	+	+	+	+	-
	Matsuda et al.[27]	Hands on hips, hip 20°flexed	3 trials of 60 s each leg	NR	NR	+	+	+	NR	-
	Matsuda et al.[57]	Bipedal: heels together, arms hanging lose; Unipedal: hands on hips, hip 20° flexed	3 trials of 60 s each leg. Mean of the two with lowest sway was used for analysis	NR	Looking at a fixed point	+	+	+	-	+

Sport/activity	Author & year	Position	Trial	Task	Visual instructions	Sex	Age	Weight/height/foot size	General activity level	Sample size
	Paillard et al.[30]	Arms along the body, foot on landmarks, leg flexed at 90 ° at the knee	51.2 s	Stand as still as possible	Looking at a mark on the wall	+	+	+	-	+
	Paillard & Noe[31]	Arms along the body, feet on landmarks, legs straight, feet 30°. 5cm apart	51.2 s	Stand as still as possible	Looking at a mark on the wall	+	+	+	NR	+
	Paillard et al. [58]	Barefoot, arms along the body, feet on landmarks, legs straight, feet 30°. 5cm apart	51.2 s	Stand as still as possible	Looking at a fixed target, 2 m away	+	+	+	National/ regional level 5/6 vs 2 days p/wk training	-
Surfing	Chapman et al.[19]	Foot position was standardized	30 s	Attempt to stand as still as possible	Gazing in a ''natural forward direction at nothing in particular'' at a blank, white wall	+	+	Expert surfers smaller & lighter than swimmers.	+ (expert surfers >. swimmers)	+
	Paillard et al.[41]	Barefoot, arms along the body, feet together, legs straight	50 s	Stand as still as possible	Looking at a fixed target, 2 m away	+	+	+	NR	-
Taekwondo	Leong et al.[59]	Barefoot	20 s. Mean of 3 trials	Attempt to stand as still as possible	Looking forward	+	-	-	-	-
Tai chi	Guan et al.[60]	NR	3 trials of 15 s	NR	NR	+	+	+	+	+
	Mak et al.[26]	Arms hanging freely	10 s	NR	Looking at a target	NR	+	NR	NR	-
	Wu et al.[39]	Heels 10 cm apart, toes 10°	30 s. Average of 5 trials	Stand as stable as possible	Looking at a mark on the wall	+	+	+	+	+

NR = Not Reported RG = Rhythmic Gymnasts EC = Eyes Closed F=Female M=Male
+ no significant differences between groups, or analysis adjusted for this characteristic. Sample size >10 in each group.
- significant difference between groups and no adjustment in the analysis. Sample size in 1 or more groups ≤ 10.
[1] Top level shooters higher weight due to wearing competition clothes. No differences in height.
[2] Height and weight not reported.

Table III. Group comparisons and detailed results

Sport/activity	Author & year	Sport practitioners (number, sex, level, age) mean ± SD or range	Controls (number, sex, activity, level, age) mean ± SD or range	Eyes Open bipedal	Eyes Open unipedal	Eyes Closed bipedal[1]	Eyes Closed Unipedal [1]	Author's conclusions[2]
Basketball	Leanderson et al.[52]	13 ankles of 9 M players, 2nd division league, 24 (20-29)	11 controls, M, (25.5 (20-29), normally active		A, Adx, Ady			None
Cycling	Lion et al.[40]	20 M, 4 F, off road cyclists, all levels, IQR 20.5 ±6.9	24 M, road cyclist, all levels, IQR 22.1±8.8	**A%** ⤒		A% ⤒		Road cyclist have a preferential usage of visual information
Dancing/ soccer	Gerbino et al.[22]	32 F modern and classical dance first level, 20.3 ± 1.5	32 F soccer players, varsity, age 19.7		**A** ⤓ , V ⤓		A, V ⤓	Dancers have better standing balance than soccer players in some tests
Dancing	Hugel et al.[23]	12 F, 6 M, professional dancers of the National ballet, 16-37	46, sex NR, healthy, never regularly practiced any physical activity	**A**⤓ V ⤒		**V** ⤒ A ⤓ ,		Balancing skills cannot be transferred to tasks of everyday life
	Leanderson et al.[7]	26 M, 27 F, royal Swedish ballet, 26	23 active M and F (20-29)		**A, Ad (M)**⤓ , A (F)			None
Dancing/ track athletes	Schmit et al.[33]	5 F, 5 M, student dancers, ≥ 5 years training, 20	10 track athletes, 5 M, 19.5	V, Asd (x, y)		V, Asd (x,y)		Dancers exhibit different dynamic patterns of PS
	Simmons[34]	17 F, intermediate, advanced or professional, 21.4 ± 0.68	17 matched non-dancers	A%		A%		No differences between groups in static measurements
Football	Handrigan et al.[53]	5 M, 6F, <4 hrs/wk training, 20.9 ±1.5	7 M, 4 F controls, no regular training, 24 ± 3.8	Footbal vs. C; **V, Range x, Range y** ⤒ Football vs. OS; V, Range y ⤓ Range x		Fottball vs. C;**V** ⤒ Football vs. OS; ⤓		None
General activity	Ageberg et al.[12]	36 M,39 F healthy volunteers, 29.5 ± 8.2	Regression analysis		In M; Vx, Vy, Ax ⤓ Ay ⤒ In F; Ax ⤓ Vx Vy Ay ⤒			Activity level did not significantly affect standing balance
Gymnastics	Asseman et al.[17]	13 M elite, 21.6 ± 4	13 other sportsmen regional level 22.1 ± 3	V, A ⤒	A ⤓ , V ⤓	V, A ⤒	V, A ⤓	Gymnasts only show less sway in trained configurations

Sport/activity	Author & year	Sport practitioners (number, sex, level, age) mean ± SD or range	Controls (number, sex, activity, level, age) mean ± SD or range	Eyes Open bipedal	Eyes Open unipedal	Eyes Closed bipedal[1]	Eyes Closed Unipedal [1]	Author's conclusions[2]
	Gautier et al.[21]	12 M, nationally ranked 22.2 ± 4.1	12 M non- gymnasts experts in other sports, 21.7 ± 3.1	Asdy ⤒				None
	Vuillerme et al.[36]	7 M, > 10 years regional or higher, 21.1 ± 1.3	7 M soccer and handball , experts, 22.6 ± 2.1	Vy		Vy		None
	Vuillerme et al.[37]	6 M experts, 20.6 ± 1.4	6 M soccer, handball tennis, experts, 23.3 ± 1.5	V, Range	Range ⤒ , V	Range ⤒ , V	**V, Range** ⤓	EO no differences. Gymnasts less sway during EC unipedal
	Vuillerme et al.[38]	7 M experts, regional or higher, 20.1 ± 2.0	7 M soccer and handball. Experts, 22.0 ± 3.6	V	V ⤓			Gymnasts are less dependent on cognition for postural control
Golf	Stemm et al.[54]	17 M, handicap 0-9, mean age all groups (incl controls) 39.6	16 M golfers, handicap 10-16, 19 M golfers, handicap 17+	V	V			Balance is not significantly different among golfers with different skills
Ironman	Nagy et al.[28]	10, 33 ± 7.6	10 firemen, active in sports, 3 times p/wk, 33 ± 4.1	V, Vx ⤓ Vy		**V, Vx, Vy** ⤓		
Judo	Paillard et al.[55]	11 M 17.6 ± 0.3 , (inter)national level	9 M regional level, 17.4 ± 0.4	V, Vx,Vy,Vsd, A ⤓		V, Vx,Vy,Vsd, A ⤒		No differences. Vision is more important to higher level judoists
Judo/ Dancing	Perrin et al.[32]	17 M, (inter)national, 24.8 ± 4.5 . 14 F dancers national ballet, 22.1± 4.5	21 F, 21 M, low level of physical activity, 23.9 ± 4.2	Judo vs. C; **V & A/s** ⤓ Vy ⤓ Vx ⤒ Judo vs Dancers; V,Vy, A/s ⤓ Vx ⤒ Dancers. vs C; V,Vy, A ⤓ Vx		Judo vs. C; **V & A/s** ⤓ , Vy ⤓ Vx Judo vs. Dancers; **Vx, A/s** ⤓ , Vy ⤓ Dancers vs C; Vy ⤓ , V, A ⤒ **Vx** ⤒		Judoist do better in all circumstances. Visual input is of major importance in dancers
Rhythmic gymnastics	Calavalle et al.[18]	15 F ,18.4 ± 4.6 , experts	43 sports students, F no experts, 22.1± 5.6	**Adx** ⤓ A ⤓ Ad ⤓ **Ady**⤒		**Adx** ⤓ A ⤓ Ad ⤓ **Ady**⤒		Rhythmic gymnastics seems to have a direct effect on the ability to maintain bipedal posture, especially in ML direction
Shooting (including biathlon)	Aalto et al.[16]	8 rifle, 2 pistol shooters, 2 F, 8 M, national team, 33.1 (17-51)	17 soldiers, 34.1 (19-57)	**V**⤓		**V**⤓		Training improves posture

Sport/activity	Author & year	Sport practitioners (number, sex, level, age) mean ± SD or range	Controls (number, sex, activity, level, age) mean ± SD or range	Eyes Open bipedal	Eyes Open unipedal	Eyes Closed bipedal[1]	Eyes Closed Unipedal [1]	Author's conclusions[2]
	Era et al.[20]	6 M , 31.8 ±7.5 ; 3 F, 28.7 ± 5.1 , international; 8 M, national, 28.3 ± 4.8 .	7 M, basic knowledge of shooting, 31.6 ± 5.3	**A, Vy, Vx** ↓				Systematically better postural control in trained athletes
Shooting/ Fencing	Herpin et al. [43]	4 F, 6 M, shooters, national level, IQR 19.5 ± 2.8 ; 5 F, 7 M, fencers, national level, IQR 22 ± 2.2	3 F, 7 M, no sporting activities, IQR 23 ± 1.3	Shooters & fencers vs C: V,A ↓ ,Ay ↑ **Ax** ↓ Shooters vs fencers V, Ax, Ay , A ↓		Shooters & fencers vs C: **V, A, Ax** ↓ Ay ↓ (fencers v C Ay) ; Shooters vs Fencers V, A, Ay,Ax ↓		Balance control was more efficient in fencers and shooters
	Konttinen et al.[24]	6 rifle shooters, M, international level, 31.8 ±7.5	6 rifle shooters, M, national, 30.2 ± 3.5	**Vx, Vy, Aside** ↓				Elite shooters sway less than non-elite, main difference in Vy
	Larue et al.[25]	2 rifle shooters, M, expert, 23; 2 M biathlon expert, 32.5	2 M biathlon novice, 25.5; 2 rifle shooters, M, novice 23.5.	**V, Vsd** ↓				Biathletes and rifle shooters adapt to the specific demands of their discipline
	Niinimaa et al.[29]	4 M rookies, 20.5 ± 2.1 ; 4 biathletes M, 30 ± 4 ; 4 shooters M, 35 ± 17.5	4 M, 21 ± 0.8	**Vx** ↓ ; V, Vy ↓				None
	Su et al.[35]	6 M rifle shooters, 21.2(17-30) ; 5 F, 16.8(16-18) . Olympic level	11 M, 25.3 (24-28) , 11 F 22 (21-23), college students,	**V, Vmax** ↓ A		**V, Vmax** ↓ A ↓		Shooters have better stability than untrained controls
Skiing	Noé[42]	7 M, national level, 22 ± 3	7M, regional level, 18 ± 1	**A** ↑ V ↑		**A** ↑ V ↑		National skiers displayed inferior performance
Soccer	Jakobsen et al.[56]	43 M, untrained, 21-45 yr, randomised controlled trial	12 soccer, 12 running, 9 high intensity interval running, 10 no training		Soccer vs. C; **V, A** ↓ Soccer vs. Interval, Running; V, A ↓ Interval vs C: **V, A** ↓ Interval vs Running; V, A ↓ Running vs C ;**V**↓ , A ↓			Soccer, I, and R reduced sway. Soccer superior changes postural control
	Matsuda et al.[27]	10 M soccer, 20.8 ± 2.5; 10 M basketball 19.6 ± 0.5; 10 M swimming 20.1 ± 1.3. All >6 years training	10 non athletes, M, 20.9 ± 0.9		[4] Soccervs all; **Ax, Ay** ↓ Soccer vs. Swimming & C; V ↓ Soccer vs. Basketball; V Basketball vs C; V Basketball vs Swimming; Ay ↓			Soccer players have superior balance in unipedal stance

Sport/activity	Author & year	Sport practitioners (number, sex, level, age) mean ± SD or range	Controls (number, sex, activity, level, age) mean ± SD or range	Eyes Open bipedal	Eyes Open unipedal	Eyes Closed bipedal[1]	Eyes Closed Unipedal[1]	Author's conclusions[2]
					Basketball vs Swimming & C; Ax ⤒			
	Matsuda et al.[57]	15 M, national level, 24 ± 3	15 M, regional level, 23 ±3	[3] **V, Ax, Ay ⭳**	[3] **V, Ax, Ay ⭳**			None
	Paillard et al.[30]	15 M, national, 24 ± 3	15 M soccer players, regional, 23 ±3		**V, A ⭳**		**V, A ⭳**	In for soccer specific test conditions, sports level influenced performance
	Paillard & Noe[31]	25 M, regional level 20.5 ± 2	25 no soccer players, M 21.2 ± 1.3	**V, Vsd, A ⭳**		**V, Vsd, A ⭳**		High level sportsmen show improved balance control in relation with the requirement of the discipline
	Paillard et al.[58]	8 M, national level, 24 ± 3	9 M, regional level, 23 ± 2	**V ⭳** , A		**V ⭳** , A		National level showed better postural control
Surfing	Chapman et al.[19]	21 M, expert surfers, 24.4 ± 4	20 M surfers, recreational (C), 24.2 ± 3; 19 M swimmers and water polo experts, 21.5 ± 2	Surfers vs. Swimmers; **V** ⤒ , A ⤒ Surfers vs. C; V, A ⤒		Surfers vs. Swimmers; A ⭳ V ⤒ Surfers vs. C V, A ⤒		Standard sway indices are not able to differentiate between surfers and controls
	Paillard et al. [41]	9 M, (inter) national level, 22.1 ± 3.1	8 M, local level, 22.2 ± 3.3	V ⭳ , A ⭳		V ⭳ , A ⭳		(Inter) national level surfers did not have better postural control
Taekwondo	Leong et al.[59]	9 M, 23.4 ±1.3	17 M obese subjects 36.9 ±7.73; 15 M controls, 38.5 ± 9.7, both groups no regular PA	A% ⭳		**A% ⭳**		Taekwondo practitioners have better balance, especially in EC
Tai chi	Guan et al.[60]	16 F, 3 M, 61.9 ± 4.8 , 30-45 min > 3 x p/week >1 y	4M, 15 F, physical active, 63.4 ± 4.4	**A ⭳**		**A ⭳**		Tai chi practitioners demonstrated improved postural control
	Mak et al.[26]	8, sex NR , 3 days p/week >1 hour for > 3 y, 44 ±12	8 non tai chi practising, 43 ±11.5	**Ay ⭳** V,A,Ax ⭳	**V, A, Ax, Ay ⭳**	**A,Ay ⭳** V, Ax ⭳		Tai chi practitioners have better balance
	Wu et al.[39]	10 M,10 F, 62 ± 4 3 days p/week 1 hour for > 3 y	5 M, 14 F, PA level equal, 63 ± 4	**Range x, Range y ⭳**		**Range x, Range y ⭳**		None

⭳ = lower velocity or smaller area, no arrow= same velocity or area, or no effect size reported, ⤒ higher velocity or more area, (significant outcomes in bold)

EO=Eyes open, EC=Eyes Closed or vision occluded. NR=Not Reported, AP=Anterior-Posterior, ML= Medio-Lateral ,CoP= Centre of Pressure, SD= Standard Deviation
C= controls (no specific sports, or lower level of sport), OS = other sports, M=Male, F=Female, PA= Physical Activity
V= Velocity, Vmax = maximum Velocity, Vsd= SD of Velocity
A= Area (i.e. 1 SD mean CoP, 90% Area, 90% confidence ellipse), Asd = SD of CoP position, A/s = Area per second, Aside= length of the side of the CoP square, Ad= mean amplitude, Range = maximal deviation of the CoP position, A% = Percentage mean amplitude (AP) of theoretical maximum, x= Medio Lateral direction, y= Anterior Posterior direction
IQR= Median and interquartile range
[1] Eyes closed, or vision occluded
[2] Only concerning the aim of this review
[3] Variables derived from factor analysis, most prominently resembling velocity and amplitude

All included studies were cross-sectional studies and had a comparative design except the studies of Ageberg et al.[12] which used a regression analysis within a cohort, and Jakobsen et al [56], which was designed as a randomised controlled trial. All but one study examined the effects of various sports activities on PS.

One study used soldiers[16], and another study[28] used fire-fighters as controls. Eleven studies[7;23;26;34;35;39;52;53;57;59;60] used controls that did not practice any specific sport, 9 studies used participants in other sports as control group[17;18;21;22;33;36-38;40], 12 studies used participants that participated in the same sports but at a different level as controls[20;24;25;30;31;41;42;54;55;58]. Six studies had two or more control groups. These groups consisted of participants practicing other sports and non-sport practitioners[27;43;56], sport practitioners practising the same sport but at another level and controls not participating in any sport[29;32], and of practitioners of the same sport but at a different level and a group practicing another sport[19].

Bipedal stance with eyes open was the most common condition, used in 32 studies[16-21;23-25;28-43;53-55;57-60]. Bipedal stance with eyes closed was used in 25 studies[16-19;23;26;28;30-37;39-43;53;55;58-60]. Unipedal stance with eyes open was used in 13 studies[7;12;17;22;26;27;30;37;38;52;54;56;57] of which in 4 studies the participants also had to close the eyes in unipedal stance[17;22;30;37]. Four studies measured PS during a shooting task [20;24;25;29].

3.1 Outcome variables

Velocity (31 studies), and area (32 studies) related variables were used to a similar extent. Six studies[18;27;28;30;55;58] computed Fourier transformations to examine sway in various frequency bands. Three of these 6 studies, all conducted by the same researcher, used the same frequency bands[30;55;58]. Other researchers differed in their choice of frequency bands. One study[33] examined sway dynamics by recurrence quantification analysis (RQA).

3.2 Methodological aspects

Fourteen studies did not report any data about weight or height of the participants[16;23;25;26;32;33], or reported a significant difference between control and experimental groups on 1 or more of these items[7;17-20;20;22;59]. This was particularly a problem in studies among dancers, in which only 1 out of 5 studies[34] reported differences on anthropometric and demographic variables not to be significant. One study reported a significant difference in weight[22], 1 study a significant difference in height[7] and the other 2[23;33] did not report on anthropometric variables.

In 24 of 39 studies in this review a measurement time shorter than 60 s was used. Eighteen of these 24 studies used a measurement time of 30 seconds or less. Five studies in this review[7;18;27;29;52] used measurements of 60 s or more, and 9 studies[12;33;34;39;40;53;56;57;59] used average results from multiple measurements that resulted in a total measurement time of ≥60s.

In 20 studies[16;20;24;25;27-29;33;36-38;41;42;52;53;53;55;56;58;60] the sample size of the experimental group was smaller than 10, which increases the risk of a type II error. In 10 studies no level of physical activity was reported, and in another 10 studies the level of physical activity differed significantly between groups.

3.3 Results in different physical sport activities

Table IV. Main findings in comparisons of sport practitioners with control groups[a].

Sport	Bipedal Eyes open			Unipedal Eyes open			Bipedal Eyes closed [b]			Unipedal Eyes closed [b]		
	less	ns	more	less	ns	more	less	ns	more	less	ns	more
Shooting	5 (37)	2 (14)					3 (31)					
Soccer	3 (48)			4 (60)			2 (23)			1 (15)		
Tai Chi	2 (28)	1 (19)		1 (19)			3 (47)					
Judo	1 (17)	1 (11)					1 (17)	1 (11)				
Dancing	1 (18)	2 (31)		1 (53)				2 (31)	1 (18)			
Gymnastics		1 (13)		1 (13)				1 (13)			1 (13)	
Fencers		1 (12)					1 (12)					
Taekwondo		1 (11)					1 (11)					
Triathlon		1 (10)					1 (10)					
Rhythmic		1 (15)						1 (15)				
Surfing		2 (30)										
Golf		1 (17)			1 (17)			1 (17)				
Interval				1 (7)								
Running				1 (9)								
Basketball					2 (19)			2 (19)				
Physical Activity					1 (75)			1 (75)				
Football			1 (11)						1 (11)			
Skiïng			1 (7)						1 (7)			

[a] Main findings in velocity and amplitude related variables. Sports compared to control groups with no specific physical activities, or lower level of the same or other sports. Presented are number of studies and (total number of subjects in the sporting groups). Comparisons were considered as less of more sway when one or more of the outcomes significantly differed. ns =Comparisons without significant differences, or with conflicting differences.

[b] Eyes closed, or vision occluded.

Table V. Main findings in comparison with sport practitioners of similar level from different sports[a].

	Bipedal Eyes open	Unipedal Eyes open	Bipedal Eyes closed [b]	Unipedal Vision occluded [b]
Less sway[c]		Dancing vs Soccer n=32[22] Soccer vs Basketball and Swimming n=10[27]	Judo vs Dancing n= 14[32]	Gymnastics vs OS n=6[37]
Inconclusive	Judo vs Dancing n=14[32] Gymnastics vs OS n=12[21], 7[38], 6[37], 7[36] Dancing vs Track athletes n=10[33] Football vs OS n=9[53] Shooters vs Fencers n=10[43]	Gymnastics vs OS n=6[37], 7[38] Basketball vs Swimming n=15[27] Interval vs Running n=7l[56]	Gymnastics vs OS n=6[37], 7[36] Dancing vs Track athletes n=10[33] Surfing vs Swimming n=21[19] Off road vs Road cycling n=20[40] Football vs OS n=9[53] Shooters vs Fencers n=10[43]	Dancing vs Soccer n=32[22]
More sway	Surfing vs Swimming n=21[19] Off road vs Road cycling n=20[40]			

[a] Main findings in velocity and amplitude related variables. The sport mentioned first is the sport of interest in the original study. Comparisons were considered as less or more sway when one or more outcomes significantly differed. Comparisons without significant differences or with conflicting differences were classified as inconclusive. Numbers refer to the number of subjects in the sporting group.

[b] Eyes closed, or vision occluded.

[c] Less sway = smaller CoP velocity or amplitude.

OS= Experts in other sports; [21] Experts in handball, track and field, volleyball, table tennis, and football, [36] [38] Experts in Soccer and Handball, [37]Experts in Soccer, Handball and Tennis.

3.3.1 Shooters

Shooters consistently had lower sway velocity than controls in the 7 studies included in this review. In Niinimaa et al.[29] and Herpin et al. [43], the lower velocity in experienced shooters did not reach statistical difference from that of controls. In both studies, a small sample size was used (respectively n=8 and n=10). Su et al.[35] found 1 out of 8 velocity variables not significantly different between groups, but still lower for shooters.

The same pattern as for sway velocity was seen for area related variables. Two out of 4 studies found significantly lower values for (more experienced) shooters[20;24]. With closed eyes, all 3 studies conducted in this condition found lower CoP velocity for shooters compared to controls[16;35;43], and 1[43] out of 2[35;43] a significantly smaller area travelled. In a comparison with fencers, no differences were detected between groups, neither in eyes open, nor in eyes closed condition[43].

Two studies measured velocity and area as a function of time during a shooting task. La Rue et al.[25] found sway to decrease with time to the actual shot for all subjects. Era et al.[20] found the same decrease in sway, but only for shooters. In 4 of the 7 studies, participants were not measured in standard static bipedal stance, but in a stance with the upper body rotated towards a target according to the shooting position.

3.3.2 Soccer

In all 5 studies that compared soccer players with controls, soccer players showed lower sway velocity and smaller area[27;30;31;57;58]. These differences were statistically significant in bipedal stance with eyes open[31;57;58], eyes closed[31;58], in unipedal stance with the eyes opened[27;30;57] and with eyes closed[30]. There was a minority of non-significant differences in these studies (area in bipedal stance eyes open and closed[58], velocity in unipedal stance[27]) and for no condition or variable did soccer players show more sway than controls.

In 2 studies, soccer players were compared with other ahtletes : basketball players, swimmers[27], and dancers[22]. In unipedal stance with eyes open, soccer players showed smaller sway area than basketball players[27], swimmers[27], but larger sway area than dancers[22]. Differences in sway velocity were not significant in these studies. In unipedal stance with eyes closed differences in sway velocity also became non significant[22]. The groups were comparable with respect to age, height, and weight.

In addition to this, Matsuda et al.[57], found soccer players to show significantly less sway when standing on the non dominant leg than on the dominant leg. In this study the non-dominant leg was defined as the weight bearing leg in kicking. This difference between legs was only noted in soccer players, not in controls. The only randomised controlled trial included in this review[56], administered a soccer training to the experimental group for three times a week throughout three months. Control groups received interval running, moderate intense running or no training. Soccer training was superior in reducing PS compared to all control groups.

3.3.3 Dancing

With eyes open, dancers showed less sway in bipedal stance in 1[23] out of 3 studies[23;32;34], and less sway in 2 studies in unipedal stance, compared to controls[7] and soccer players[22]. With eyes closed, dancers swayed more than controls[23] or practitioners in other sports[32], while in the remaining comparisons no significant differences were detected with controls[32;34] or practitioners in other sports[22;33].

No study found a significantly lower sway for dancers in eyes closed condition[22;23;32-34].

3.3.4 Gymnastics

In bipedal stance no significant differences were found between gymnasts and experts in other sports[21;36-38] [21;36-38] and gymnasts and controls (practitioners in other sports at a lower level[17], neither with eyes open, nor with eyes closed. In unipedal stance with eyes open, 1 of 3 studies[17;37;38] found a significantly smaller sway area for gymnasts, compared to controls[17], while the 2 other studies did not detect significant differences between gymnasts and experts in other sports. In unipedal stance with eyes closed, the opposite was found: no significant differences with controls[17], and a significantly smaller and slower sway than experts in other sports[37].

In bipedal stance with eyes open and eyes closed, female rhythmic gymnasts showed a significantly smaller sway area in the ML direction, but a larger area in the AP direction than female non-expert sport students[18]. The rhythmic gymnasts were substantially shorter and lighter than controls.

3.3.5 Tai Chi

Tai Chi practitioners were compared with controls, and showed less sway in all conditions. Three studies[26;39;60] were conducted in bipedal stance eyes open and eyes closed, and 1 study[26] in bipedal stance with eyes open. The largest differences were found in unipedal stance. The magnitude of the differences between tai chi practitioners and controls was comparable in eyes open and eyes closed conditions in all studies.

3.3.6 Judo

Judoist were compared with controls in 2 studies[32;55], both used the bipedal stance. With eyes open judoist swayed less in both studies, although in the study of Paillard et al.[55], the difference was not significant. With eyes closed, in the study of Perrin et al.[32], judoists still had slower and smaller sway than controls, but in the study of Paillard et al.[55], top judoists showed more and faster sway than judoist at a regional level. The differences in the comparisons of Paillard et al.[55] were not significant, but the interaction between condition and group did turn out to be significant. This led the authors to the conclusion that top judoist are more dependent on vision than controls. The control group used in this study, consisted of 9 judoists who practiced their sport at a lower level, but with the same amount of training (10-14 hours per week).

Perrin et al.[32] also compared top-level male judoists with top level female dancers. There were no or only small non-significant differences seen with eyes open, but with eyes closed judoists swayed significantly less than dancers.

3.3.7 Surfing

Sway variables in surfers, in bipedal stance with eyes open and with eyes closed, were not significantly different from controls[19;41]. Surfers were studied in bipedal stance with eyes open and with eyes closed. Compared with swimmers, surfers maintained their balance with eyes open with significantly higher sway velocity[19]. With eyes open, surfers showed more sway as expressed in area and velocity related variables than swimmers/waterpolo players and lower-level surfers[19]. The difference in sway velocity with swimmers was significant, but not with eyes closed. Anthropometric differences were of advantage for surfers in comparison with swimmers/waterpolo players.

3.3.8 Running

Nagy et al.[28] compared 10 triathletes with 10 physically active firemen. After adjustment for relevant confounders, triathletes showed a lower total sway velocity and lower velocities in ML and AP directions, but only with eyes closed. Running as intervention was used in a RCT, to compare the effect of interval running, soccer training and no training[56]. All 3 training modalities led to a lesser sway over a period of 12 weeks, but the size of the effect was the largest and most consistent over all sway variables in the group that received soccer training.

3.3.9 Other sports

Basketball players did not differ significantly from non-sport practitioners[27;52] and had more sway than soccer players[27]. American football players showed comparable sway levels (velocity and range) to obese controls with similar weight, but significantly more than lighter, non-obese controls[53]. Sway velocity of 52 golfers of three different levels, grouped by ‘golf handicap’, was assessed by Stemm[54]. There were no differences in sway velocity between groups, neither in bipedal condition, nor in unipedal conditions. Road cyclists showed less sway bipedal than off road cyclists when visual information was available[40]. With closed eyes, both groups did not differ anymore. Noé and Paillard[42] compared skiers from different levels with each other. Skiers on a national level showed higher velocity and larger area than skiers on regional level. The differences in area were significant, in velocity they were not. In an additional condition, wearing ski boots and standing in a skiing position, the effect of expertise reversed: top-level skiers showed less sway on both parameters, although not statistically significant. Finally, in taekwondo practitioners in bipedal stance, a smaller sway amplitude than in non-active controls was found, but this difference was only significant in the eyes closed condition.

3.3.10 General Activity

Ageberg et al.[12] performed two regression analyses, stratified for men and women, with PA in general, weight and age as independent variables. They corrected for relevant confounders. In a sample of 75 healthy volunteers, they found no association between PA and PS.

4. Discussion

This systematic review identified 39 studies that investigated the relation between (sport) activities and PS in non perturbed standing. The main conclusion was that, in general, sport practitioners sway less than controls and high-level athletes sway less than low-level athletes. Additionally, we identified specific effects dependent on the use of vision, sport specific postures, and frequency and duration of the (sports) activity.

For every sport or activity, the direction of the significant differences in PS was the same for all conditions. A consistent exception was dancing, in which dancers tended to show lesser sway than controls and practitioners in other sports with eyes open, but more sway with eyes closed. A similar interaction was found in a comparison of judoists of different levels.

This is in contrast with the intuitive assumption that the balance challenging positions and movements that dancers perform, should lead to less sway. However, postural control depends on the integration of visual, proprioceptive and vestibular signals. Dependent on the task, the postural control system can weigh sources of information, making the control system 'task specific'. In dancing, visual information is a very rich source of information. Visual dominance in sensorimotor integration has been proposed before to explain findings in dancers[32]. In on-road cycling, vision is also a more dominant information source than in off-road cycling[40]. On-road cyclists indeed showed less sway than off road cyclists when visual information was available[40], but this better performance diminished when the eyes were closed. Top judoist also seem to depend more on vision than judoist at a regional level[55], although Perrin et al[32] found judoists to show less sway than controls who exhibited a low level of PA in both eyes open and eyed closed condition. We suggest that all balance control systems, visual, proprioceptive and vestibular, are trained in judo, but that the emphasis is on the visual system.

For most sports, practitioners depend on proprioceptive and vestibular signals as the primary sources of information. Practitioners of tai chi, fencing, taekwondo and soccer showed, in bipedal stance with eyes open, non significant differences or less PS than controls. With eyes closed or in unipedal stance, when proprioceptive and vestibular information becomes more important, significant differences stayed significant, and non significant differences became significant.

In gymnastics, the role of vision is less clear. Visual cues can be an important part of gymnastics in some apparatus (i.e. floor and vault), but the emphasis in pommel horse, rings and bars is on proprioceptive and/or vestibular signals. Results in gymnasts are all non significant in bipedal stance, but results in unipedal stance are not consistent. One study only found significant differences with eyes open[17], not with eyes closed, and another study only found significant differences with eyes closed, not with eyes open[37]. In both studies gymnasts were compared to sport practitioners in other sports. These findings led to contradictory conclusions about the role of vision in gymnastics. A third study only used the eyes open condition and found no differences. We therefore can only conclude that gymnasts possibly have a reduced PS in unipedal stance.

These findings suggest that balance abilities are specific to a particular task, a hypothesis first posed by Henry[46]. We found more indications that the specific characteristics of a sport or activity cause the varied results in our review. In shooting, bipedal stance with visual focus on the target is the practised position. The positive effect that standing still has on shooting performance is reflected in the direct relationship between the amount of sway and performance, which has been shown in novice shooters[20;61]. In all included studies, shooters showed less sway, although the difference was not always significant. Specificity of the requirements of the sport, was further emphasized by the finding that high-level shooters showed a significant reduction of PS the closer the measurement was to the firing of the shot[20;25].Era et al.[20] also observed a more pronounced sway among naive shooters in less successful trials. No studies were performed in other conditions than bipedal stance. To confirm the 'specificity hypothesis' for shooters, studies in which shooters are compared to sport practitioners in non sport specific conditions (e.g. unipedal) will be of value.

Besides the systematically reviewed conditions, several other tests that have been performed in the included studies strengthen the idea of a condition and task specific relation between activities in sport and PS. Differences between shooters and controls increased when an aiming position was taken[29], and for soccer players smaller effect sizes were found on seesaws for national level than for regional level soccer players[30]. This led Paillard et al.,[30] to the conclusion that better performance is only seen in for soccer specific test conditions. In another study, national level skiers showed more sway than regional level skiers. In a position that reflected the specific sports activity, wearing skiboots and standing in a 100° knee angle, the differences between groups vanished[42]. Furthermore, better postural control in (inter)national level surfers than in regional level surfers, only became manifest on an unstable surface[41]. In soccer players, specificity of the sports activity was even seen in a comparison between the legs. Differences between national and regional soccer players were significantly larger when standing on the non-dominant leg [57]. Running, and activity in general, can be considered as an activity that requires only small balance capacities. Ageberg et al.,[12] did not find an effect of physical activity in general, but Nagy et al.[28] found that tri-athletes showed lower sway velocity with eyes closed than physically active fireman. The most striking difference between these two studies is the extremely high level of PA in the group of tri-athletes. These findings are in line with Jakobsen et al's[56] study, which was the only included study with a randomized controlled trial design. In this study a training program consisting of 12 weeks continuous endurance running, led to small and not always significant minimizing effects on sway velocity and area, while a training program consisting of high intensity interval training led to larger and significant effects on PS. However, both programs had significantly less effect on sway than a soccer training program. An explanation for the findings in these studies could be the influence of duration and intensity on the effect on PS. Although running does not require much balance challenging tasks, when practised long and intensively enough, there still seems to be an effect on PS. In our review 10 studies noted significant differences in physical activity level, and 10 studies did not report the activity level of participants. This poses a potential threat to the validity of our conclusions. In our opinion, the chances of confounding in this review are not large, because PA levels are most likely not as extreme as in triathletes, most of these studies examined sports that were also included in studies with no significant differences in PA between groups, and in some cases even more sway was measured for the group with the highest PA level[23]. However, future studies into the specific effects of a sport or activity should take equality of physical activity between the groups into account.

Next to practising a sport, the differences in PS could also have a genetic or developmental cause. Maybe the capacity to control PS in a specific condition, is a prerequisite to become a high-level athlete. This review cannot sufficiently distinguish between cause and consequence. Only one prospective (RCT) was included, which did support an effect of sports activity on PS. On the other hand, Paillard et al.[55] used a design in which the higher level of sports practice in one of the studied groups was likely due to being more talented and not the result of practice. In this study, judoists in both groups trained the same amount of time, but only differed in level of competence. With a sample size of 11 judoists, they found an almost significant advantage for the higher level judoists with eyes open, which disappeared when eyes were closed.

Thirty seven percent of all studies detected significant differences in bipedal stance with eyes open, 68 % in unipedal eyes open, 55% bipedal eyes closed, and 50% of just four studies in unipedal stance with eyes closed. Furthermore, in all sports that were investigated in bipedal stance with eyes open, differences between sport practitioners en controls, were replicated in more challenging conditions (unipedal or eyes closed) (soccer, judo, golf, football, skiing), or more pronounced (shooting, tai chi, gymnastics, fencers, taekwondo, triathlon). This suggests that bipedal standing quietly on a solid surface, bipedal, with eyes open is not a task challenging enough to detect small differences in PS between groups of sport practitioners. There is another indication that supports this hypothesis. In some of the included studies, manipulations of the standing surface, surroundings or distraction of the participant were performed as an extra task. Almost every extra task resulted in larger differences between sport practitioners and controls. Only one study did find results in standing but not in a more challenging condition, imposed by using a seesaw device[30]

In light of this evidence, more challenging tasks, like standing on foam or standing in unipedal, stance should be considered in addition to the standard bipedal task.

Additional to a more challenging task, it seems plausible that also the kind of verbal instruction at least partly determines the amount of sway. Seven of the 39 studies in this review did not report which instruction was given. To make future studies better comparable it is advisable that participants are told to stand as still as possible or at least to report the specific instruction. With respect to sensitivity, no conclusion can be drawn about the differences between area and velocity related variables.

Six included studies[17;19;28;30-32;34] stated explicitly that lower velocity or area in PS in normal stance corresponds with better postural control. It is questionable whether this assumption is true by definition.

Human sensory systems are better equipped to register changes in information than to cope with unchanging conditions and therefore richness of information might increase the stability and adaptability of the postural system[62]. In a completely static posture, without any movements of the body, there is less information available to guide the motor system in accomplishing the complex balance task of standing upright. Hence, sway might be seen as an adequate solution in quasi-static conditions and maybe the variation in the structure of PS provides a better indicator for 'dynamic balance' capacities. Among the studies included in this review only Schmit et al.[33] analyzed the structure of the PS by means of recurrence quantification analysis. They compared student dancers with track athletes and in contrast with standard measures of PSin bipedal stance, non-linear variables strongly differentiated dancers from controls. Dancers showed less regular patterns of sway. Previous research in a population with patients suffering from Parkinson's disease[63] and stroke[64], and research among sport practitioners by means of accelometry[65], suggests that less regular patterns of sway are a characteristic of increased postural stability. Analyzing the regularity of the CoP pattern does not require extra efforts in the experimental setup. Therefore, it seems worthwhile to also perform non linear analyses in future studies.

This review exposed some limits of comparative studies on PS. One of these is the duration of the trial. Reliability of postural stability measures is increased with an increase in length of the trial, or by averaging more than one trial[66;67]. Carpenter et al.[67] advised a measurement duration from 60s to 120s. Eighteen of the 39 included studies used a measurement time of ≤ 30 s, which could have led to type II errors.

Most studies did not report raw data per tested condition (i.e. means and standard deviations) or effect sizes. Therefore a meta-analysis could not be performed, while the similarity of experimental set ups and populations would have made a meta-analysis meaningful.

5 Conclusion

This review demonstrates that in general sport practitioners sway less than controls in unperturbed stance. There is an additional effect of activity on PS that is specific for the activity or sport that is being performed. The use of vision, sport specific postures, and frequency and duration are important characteristics that determine the effect of sports activity on PS in standing.

Sway area and velocity in unperturbed bipedal stance appear to have limited sensitivity to detect subtle differences between groups of healthy people. Other conditions, like standing on foam or unipedal stance should be used when healthy people are studied.

Reference List

1. Maurer C, Peterka RJ. A new interpretation of spontaneous sway measures based on a simple model of human postural control. J Neurophysiol 2005; 93(1):189-200.

2. Mazaheri M, Coenen P, Parnianpour M, Kiers H, van Dieen JH. Low back pain and postural sway during quiet standing with and without sensory manipulation: a systematic review. Gait Posture 2013; 37(1):12-22.

3. Ihara H, Takayama M, Fukumoto T. Postural control capability of ACL-deficient knee after sudden tilting. Gait Posture 2008; 28(3):478-482.

4. Lysholm M, Ledin T, Odkvist LM, Good L. Postural control--a comparison between patients with chronic anterior cruciate ligament insufficiency and healthy individuals. Scand J Med Sci Sports 1998; 8(6):432-438.

5. O'Connell M, George K, Stock D. Postural sway and balance testing: a comparison of normal and anterior cruciate ligament deficient knees. Gait Posture 1998; 8(2):136-142.

6. Friden T, Zatterstrom R, Lindstrand A, Moritz U. A stabilometric technique for evaluation of lower limb instabilities. Am J Sports Med 1989; 17(1):118-122.

7. Leanderson J, Eriksson E, Nilsson C, Wykman A. Proprioception in classical ballet dancers: A prospective study of the influence of an ankle sprain on proprioception in the ankle joint. Am J Sports Med 1996; 24(3):370-374.

8. Yu E, Abe M, Masani K, Kawashima N, Eto F, Haga N et al. Evaluation of postural control in quiet standing using center of mass acceleration: comparison among the young, the elderly, and people with stroke. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2008; 89(6):1133-1139.

9. de Haart M, Geurts AC, Huidekoper SC, Fasotti L, van LJ. Recovery of standing balance in postacute stroke patients: a rehabilitation cohort study. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2004; 85(6):886-895.

10. Lafond D, Corriveau H, Prince F. Postural control mechanisms during quiet standing in patients with diabetic sensory neuropathy. Diabetes care 2004; 27(1):173-178.

11. Beuter A, Hernandez R, Rigal R, Modolo J, Blanchet PJ. Postural sway and effect of levodopa in early Parkinson's disease. Can J Neurol Sci 2008; 35(1):65-68.

12. Ageberg E, Zatterstrom R, Friden T, Moritz U. Individual factors affecting stabilometry and one-leg hop test in 75 healthy subjects, aged 15-44 years. Scand J Med Sci Sports 2001; 11(1):47-53.

13. Sullivan EV, Rose J, Rohlfing T, Pfefferbaum A. Postural sway reduction in aging men and women: relation to brain structure, cognitive status, and stabilizing factors. Neurobiol Aging 2009; 30(5):793-807.

14. Prado JM, Stoffregen TA, Duarte M. Postural sway during dual tasks in young and elderly adults. Gerontology 2007; 53(5):274-281.

15. Hrysomallis C. Balance ability and athletic performance. Sports Med 2011; 41(3):221-232.

16. Aalto H, Pyykko I, Ilmarinen R, Kahkonen E, Starck J. Postural stability in shooters. ORL J Otorhinolaryngol Relat Spec 1990; 52(4):232-238.

17. Asseman FB, Caron O, Cremieux J. Are there specific conditions for which expertise in gymnastics could have an effect on postural control and performance? Gait Posture 2008; 27(1):76-81.

18. Calavalle AR, Sisti D, Rocchi MB, Panebianco R, Del SM, Stocchi V. Postural trials: expertise in rhythmic gymnastics increases control in lateral directions. Eur J Appl Physiol 2008.

19. Chapman DW, Needham KJ, Allison GT, Lay B, Edwards DJ. Effects of experience in a dynamic environment on postural control. Br J Sports Med 2008; 42(1):16-21.

20. Era P, Konttinen N, Mehto P, Saarela P, Lyytinen H. Postural stability and skilled performance--a study on top-level and naive rifle shooters. J Biomech 1996; 29(3):301-306.

21. Gautier G, Thouvarecq R, Vuillerme N. Postural control and perceptive configuration: influence of expertise in gymnastics. Gait Posture 2008; 28(1):46-51.

22. Gerbino PG, Griffin ED, Zurakowski D. Comparison of standing balance between female collegiate dancers and soccer players. Gait Posture 2007; 26(4):501-507.

23. Hugel F, Cadopi M, Kohler F, Perrin P. Postural control of ballet dancers: a specific use of visual input for artistic purposes. Int J Sports Med 1999; 20(2):86-92.

24. Konttinen N, Lyytinen H, Pertti E. Brain slow potentials and postural sway behavior during sharpshooting performance. J Mot Behav 1999; 31(1):11-20.

25. LaRue J, Bard C, Otis L, Fleury M. Stability in shooting: the effect of expertise in the biathlon and in rifle shooting. Can J Sport Sci 1989; 14(1):38-45.

26. Mak MK, Ng PL. Mediolateral sway in single-leg stance is the best discriminator of balance performance for Tai-Chi practitioners. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2003; 84(5):683-686.

27. Matsuda S, Demura S, Uchiyama M. Centre of pressure sway characteristics during static one-legged stance of athletes from different sports. J Sports Sci 2008; 26(7):775-779.

28. Nagy E, Toth K, Janositz G, Kovacs G, Feher-Kiss A, Angyan L et al. Postural control in athletes participating in an ironman triathlon. Eur J Appl Physiol 2004; 92(4-5):407-413.

29. Niinimaa V, McAvoy T. Influence of exercise on body sway in the standing rifle shooting position. Can J Appl Sport Sci 1983; 8(1):30-33.

30. Paillard T, Noe F, Riviere T, Marion V, Montoya R, Dupui P. Postural performance and strategy in the unipedal stance of soccer players at different levels of competition. J Athl Train 2006; 41(2):172-176.

31. Paillard T, Noe F. Effect of expertise and visual contribution on postural control in soccer. Scand J Med Sci Sports 2006; 16(5):345-348.

32. Perrin P, Deviterne D, Hugel F, Perrot C. Judo, better than dance, develops sensorimotor adaptabilities involved in balance control. Gait Posture 2002; 15(2):187-194.

33. Schmit JM, Regis DI, Riley MA. Dynamic patterns of postural sway in ballet dancers and track athletes. Exp Brain Res 2005; 163(3):370-378.

34. Simmons RW. Sensory organization determinants of postural stability in trained ballet dancers. Int J Neurosci 2005; 115(1):87-97.

35. Su FC, Wu WL, Lee WD. Stance stability in shooters. Chin J Med Biol Eng 2000; 20(4):187-192.

36. Vuillerme N, Teasdale N, Nougier V. The effect of expertise in gymnastics on proprioceptive sensory integration in human subjects. Neurosci Lett 2001; 311(2):73-76.

37. Vuillerme N, Danion F, Marin L, Boyadjian A, Prieur JM, Weise I et al. The effect of expertise in gymnastics on postural control. Neurosci Lett 2001; 303(2):83-86.

38. Vuillerme N, Nougier V. Attentional demand for regulating postural sway: The effect of expertise in gymnastics. Brain Res Bull 2004; 63(2):161-165.

39. Wu G, Zhao F, Zhou X, Wei L. Improvement of isokinetic knee extensor strength and reduction of postural sway in the elderly from long-term Tai Chi exercise. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2002; 83(10):1364-1369.

40. Lion A, Gauchard GC, Deviterne D, Perrin PP. Differentiated influence of off-road and on-road cycling practice on balance control and the related-neurosensory organization. J Electromyogr Kinesiol 2009; 19(4):623-630.

41. Paillard T, Margnes E, Portet M, Breucq A. Postural ability reflects the athletic skill level of surfers. Eur J Appl Physiol 2011; 111(8):1619-1623.

42. Noe F, Paillard T. Is postural control affected by expertise in alpine skiing? Br J Sports Med 2005; 39(11):835-837.

43. Herpin G, Gauchard GC, Lion A, Collet P, Keller D, Perrin PP. Sensorimotor specificities in balance control of expert fencers and pistol shooters. J Electromyogr Kinesiol 2010; 20(1):162-169.

44. Bernard PL, Hue O, Eininger C, Ledrole D, Giraud P, Seynnes O. [Influence of physical activity on postural capacities of elderly: effect of time of training]. Ann Readapt Med Phys 2004; 47(4):157-163.

45. Hue OA, Seynnes O, Ledrole D, Colson SS, Bernard PL. Effects of a physical activity program on postural stability in older people. Aging Clin Exp Res 2004; 16(5):356-362.

46. Henry FM. Specificity versus generality in learning motor skill. In: Brown RC, Kenyon GS, editors. Classical Studies on Physical Activity. Englewood Cliffs (NJ): Prentice Hall; 1968. p. 340-350.

47. West S, King V, Carey TS, Lohr KN, McKoy N, Sutton SF et al. Systems to rate the strength of scientific evidence. Evid Rep Technol Assess (Summ) 2002;(47):1-11.

48. Mallen C, Peat G, Croft P. Quality assessment of observational studies is not commonplace in systematic reviews. J Clin Epidemiol 2006; 59(8):765-769.

49. Chiari L, Rocchi L, Cappello A. Stabilometric parameters are affected by anthropometry and foot placement. Clin Biomech (Bristol , Avon) 2002; 17(9-10):666-677.

50. Rogind H, Lykkegaard JJ, Bliddal H, nneskiold-Samsoe B. Postural sway in normal subjects aged 20-70 years. Clin Physiol Funct Imaging 2003; 23(3):171-176.

51. Lin D, Seol H, Nussbaum MA, Madigan ML. Reliability of COP-based postural sway measures and age-related differences. Gait Posture 2008; 28(2):337-342.

52. Leanderson J, Wykman A, Eriksson E. Ankle sprain and postural sway in basketball players. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc 1993; 1(3-4):203-205.

53. Handrigan GA, Berrigan F, Hue O, Simoneau M, Corbeil P, Tremblay A et al. The effects of muscle strength on center of pressure-based measures of postural sway in obese and heavy athletic individuals 20. Gait Posture 2012; 35(1):88-91.

54. Stemm JD, Jacobson BH, Royer TD. Comparison of stability and weight shift among golfers grouped by skill level. Percept Mot Skills 2006; 103(3):685-692.

55. Paillard T, Costes-Salon C, Lafont C, Dupui P. Are there differences in postural regulation according to the level of competition in judoists? Br J Sports Med 2002; 36(4):304-305.

56. Jakobsen MD, Sundstrup E, Krustrup P, Aagaard P. The effect of recreational soccer training and running on postural balance in untrained men. Eur J Appl Physiol 2011; 111(3):521-530.

57. Matsuda S, Demura S, Demura T. Examining differences between center of pressure sway in one-legged and two-legged stances for soccer players and typical adults. Perceptual & Motor Skills 2010; 110(3 Part 1):751-760.

58. Paillard T, Bizid R, Dupui P. Do sensorial manipulations affect subjects differently depending on their postural abilities? Br J Sports Med 2007; 41(7):435-438.

59. Leong HT, Fu SN, Ng GYF, Tsang WWN. Low-level Taekwondo practitioners have better somatosensory organisation in standing balance than sedentary people 57. Eur J Appl Physiol 2011; 111(8):1787-1793.

60. Guan H, Koceja DM. Effects of long-term tai chi practice on balance and H-reflex characteristics. Am J Chin Med 2011; 39(2):251-260.

61. Mononen K, Konttinen N, Viitasalo J, Era P. Relationships between postural balance, rifle stability and shooting accuracy among novice rifle shooters. Scand J Med Sci Sports 2007; 17(2):180-185.

62. van Emmerik RE, van Wegen EE. On the functional aspects of variability in postural control. Exerc Sport Sci Rev 2002; 30(4):177-183.

63. Schmit JM, Riley MA, Dalvi A, Sahay A, Shear PK, Shockley KD et al. Deterministic center of pressure patterns characterize postural instability in Parkinson's disease. Exp Brain Res 2006; 168(3):357-367.

64. Roerdink M, De HM, Daffertshofer A, Donker SF, Geurts AC, Beek PJ. Dynamical structure of center-of-pressure trajectories in patients recovering from stroke. Exp Brain Res 2006; 174(2):256-269.

65. Lamoth CJC, van Lummel RC, Beek PJ. Athletic skill level is reflected in body sway: A test case for accelometry in combination with stochastic dynamics
264. Gait Posture 2009; 29(4):546-551.

66. Lafond D, Corriveau H, Hebert R, Prince F. Intrasession reliability of center of pressure measures of postural steadiness in healthy elderly people. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2004; 85(6):896-901.

67. Carpenter MG, Frank JS, Winter DA, Peysar GW. Sampling duration effects on centre of pressure summary measures. Gait Posture 2001; 13(1):35-40.